

***PLEASE NOTE
DUE TO THE CONVERSION PROCESS
FROM WORD PERFECT FORMAT
TO PDF FORMAT
THE TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE
NUMBERS WILL BE OFF***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
BACKGROUND	2
I. THE <i>McDUFFY</i> DECISION	2
II. THE PRESENT PROCEEDINGS	6
III. THE EDUCATION REFORM ACT: SUMMARY OF KEY CHANGES	8
A. School Finance	9
B. Responsibilities of the Commissioner and Board of Education	10
C. Teachers	13
FINDINGS OF FACT	15
IV. THE COMMONWEALTH’S IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATION REFORM SINCE 1993	15
A. The Commonwealth’s Increased Financial Contributions to Local School Districts	15
B. Development of the Curriculum Frameworks	16
C. Development of MCAS	17
D. Teachers	19
E. The Accountability System	20
1. School Accountability System	21
2. District Accountability System	26
F. Some Highlights of Education Reform Since 1993	28

1. Greater Equalization of Funding	28
2. MCAS	29
3. NAEP	30
V. THE PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE FOUR FOCUS DISTRICTS	32
A. Introduction: The Applicable Standards	32
1. <i>McDuffy's</i> Guidelines and Seven Capabilities	32
2. The Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks	33
a. English Language Arts	35
b. Mathematics	35
c. Science	37
d. History/Social Science	37
e. The Arts	38
f. Health	39
g. Libraries	40
B. Summary of Findings and Conclusions About the Four Focus Districts	42
1. The Brockton School District	42
2. The Lowell School District	46
3. The Springfield School District	51
4. The Winchendon School District	60
C. The Brockton School District: Specific Findings	70
1. Demographic Information	70

2. School Funding	71
3. Preschool Program	73
4. Elementary Schools	74
5. Junior High Schools	75
6. Brockton High School	75
7. English/Literacy Program	76
8. Math Program	77
9. MCAS Remediation	80
10. History Program	80
11. Science Program	81
12. Arts Program	82
13. Health/Physical Education	83
14. Foreign Language Program	84
15. Libraries	84
16. Technology	86
17. Special Education	87
18. Bilingual Education	91
19. Professional Development	92
20. Teachers and Teacher Openings	93
21. School Buildings in Brockton	96
22. Brockton's MCAS Results	96
23. Brockton's SAT Scores	104

D. The Lowell School District: Specific Findings	105
1. Demographic Information	105
2. School Funding	106
3. Preschool Program	109
4. Kindergarten Program	111
5. Elementary Schools	112
6. Middle Schools	114
7. Lowell High School	118
8. English/Literacy Program	118
9. Mathematics Program	120
10. MCAS Remediation in ELA and Math	121
11. History Program	122
12. Science Program	123
13. Fine Arts Program	125
14. Health/Physical Education	126
15. Foreign Language Program	126
16. Libraries and Technology	127
17. Special Education	129
18. Professional Development	132
19. Teachers	134
20. School Buildings	134
21. Dropouts	135

22. Lowell's MCAS Results	136
23. Lowell's SAT Scores	144
E. Springfield School District: Specific Findings	144
1. Demographic Information	145
2. School Funding	146
3. Preschool Program	149
4. Kindergarten Program	150
5. Elementary Schools	150
6. Middle Schools	154
7. English/Literacy Program	157
8. Mathematics Program	159
9. History Program	161
10. Science Program	163
11. Arts Program	166
12. Health and Physical Education	168
13. Libraries	169
14. Technology	170
15. Vocational Education	171
a. Academic Program	171
b. Vocational Program	174
16. Special Education	176
17. Teachers and Teacher Openings	181

18. Professional Development	181
19. School Buildings in Springfield	183
20. Dropouts	184
21. Springfield's MCAS Results	186
22. Springfield's SAT Scores	193
F. The Winchendon School District: Specific Findings	194
1. Demographic Information	194
2. School Funding	195
3. Preschool Program	198
4. Elementary Schools	199
5. Title I Program	204
6. Middle and High School	206
7. Technology	211
8. Arts Program	212
9. Athletics Program	213
10. Special Education	214
11. Professional Development	217
12. Teachers and Professional Staff	218
13. Dropouts	220
14. Winchendon's MCAS Results	221
15. Winchendon's SAT Scores	229
16. Winchendon School District Examination by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability	230

G. Conclusion	232
VI. THE FOCUS DISTRICTS AND THE “COMPARISON” DISTRICTS	232
A. Introduction	232
B. Measures of Educational Performance	233
1. MCAS Scores	233
2. Cycle Performance Ratings	239
3. Dropout Rates	241
4. Graduation Rates	244
5. SAT Scores and Participation	245
6. Post-Graduation Plans of High School Seniors	247
C. Conclusion	247
VII. COMMON PROBLEMS OF THE FOCUS DISTRICTS	249
A. Funding	249
1. Introduction	249
2. Models to Evaluate Funding Adequacy	250
a. Successful Schools Model	250
b. Professional Judgment Model	253
(i) Dr. Verstegen’s Study	253
(ii) Dr. Smith’s Study	255
c. Comparison of Net School Spending and Foundation Budget	257
d. Value Added Analysis	262
3. Problems With Existing Foundation Budget Formula	265

a. Special Education	266
b. Curriculum Frameworks	266
c. Teachers	268
d. Bilingual Education/Limited English Proficiency	269
e. Foundation Budget Review Commission Determinations	270
f. Other Changes to the Formula	272
4. Reductions in State Funding	273
5. Conclusion	274
B. Special Education	275
1. Areas of Concern	275
2. MCAS Gap Between Regular and Special Education Students	276
3. Per-Pupil Spending on Special Education	280
4. The Special Education Component of Foundation Budget	281
C. Attracting Qualified Teachers	285
D. Facilities	289
VIII. REMEDIAL ISSUES	291
A. Early Childhood Education	291
1. Introduction	291
2. The Value of Early Childhood Education	292
3. Components of a Quality Preschool Program	295
4. Public vs. Community-Based Private Preschool Programs	296

5. Statewide Efforts to Provide Quality Early Childhood Education	299
6. Preschool in the Focus Districts	301
B. Class Size Reduction	304
1. Benefits of Small Class Size in the Early Grades	304
2. Class Size in the Focus Districts	307
C. Remediation Programs	308
FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	309
 <u>APPENDIX A:</u>	
<u>APPENDIX B:</u>	
NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001	A-1
THE MASSACHUSETTS CURRICULUM FRAMEWORKS	B-1